



# *Town of Brookline*

## *Massachusetts*

### PLANNING BOARD

Town Hall, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
333 Washington Street  
Brookline, MA 02445  
(617) 730-2130 Fax (617) 730-2442  
TTY (617) 730-2327

Mark J. Zarrillo, Chairman  
Linda K. Hamlin, Clerk  
Robert Cook  
Steven A. Heikin  
Steven R. Kanes  
Sergio Modigliani  
Jonathan Simpson

### **BROOKLINE PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES** **Room 111, First Floor, Brookline Town Hall** **March 20, 2014 – 7:30p.m.**

**Board Present:** Linda Hamlin, Robert Cook, Steven Heikin, Steven Kanes,  
Sergio Modigliani and Jonathan Simpson

**Staff Present:** Polly Selkoe and Maria Morelli

Linda Hamlin called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

### **BOARD OF APPEALS CASES**

**136 Bonad Road** – construct a 280 square foot single-story addition in the rear, requiring FAR and Design Review relief (3/27) Pct. 16

Maria Morelli described the case and the zoning relief required.

Designer Dan Memont presented the plans. Homeowner and applicant, Helen Lacouture, was present.

Linda Hamlin asked what materials would be used. Designer Dan Memont replied that very likely cedar shingles would be used on the addition with copper/metal used on the roof of the addition along with asphalt shingles.

Sergio Modigliani and Steve Heikin commented on the elevations and the roof plan and noted that the difficult geometry of the curved roof design is not revealed in the drawings: When constructed, the roof will not look as level as the drawings show. Mr. Heikin stated that the applicant should create revised drawings that would reflect the likely results of the constructed roof.

Mr. Heikin noted the inconsistency in the drawings of the windows' divided lights.

Mr. Modigliani noted that Mr. Memont is not a registered architect and that final plans would need to be stamped by an engineer. Overall, the drawings do not provide sufficient detail and should be revised to include salient dimensions, windows, roof plan, and materials.

No abutters were present.

Ms. Hamlin asked the applicant to submit ten (10) copies of letters of support from abutters to the Board of Appeals.

Linda Hamlin ***motioned to recommend approval.***

Sergio Modigliani ***seconded*** the motion.

**Voted (5-0-1): The Planning Board recommended approval of the plans prepared by designer Dan Memont of Design Dynamics dated 12/16/2013, and the site plan by John W. McEachern of Bowditch & Crandall dated 12/17/2013, subject to the following conditions:**

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit final floor plans and elevations indicating all salient dimensions, windows, roof plan, and materials subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final building plans and elevations stamped and signed by a registered architect or engineer; and 3) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

Jonathan Simpson ***abstained.***

**220 South Street** – construct an addition at the rear with an additional 110 square feet of floor area requiring FAR, Design Review, and side and rear yard setback relief (3/27) Pct. 16

Polly Selkoe described the case and the zoning relief required. This case was continued from March 6, 2014, so that the applicant could submit improved drawings.

Sean Donovan presented the revised drawings.

Linda Hamlin asked if abutters were supportive of the proposed design. The applicant, Dr. Richard Brodie, stated that abutters signed letters of support. No members of the public were present.

Linda Hamlin ***motioned to recommend approval.***

Robert Cook ***seconded*** the motion.

**Voted (6-0): the Planning Board recommends approval of the plans prepared by the applicant dated 3/11/14, and the site plan by Frank Iebba dated 10/30 /13, subject to the following conditions:**

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit, final floor plans, elevations, and materials shall be submitted to the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning for review and approval.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a final site plan, indicating any revisions or modifications, shall be submitted to the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning for review and approval.
3. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner to ensure conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan, stamped and signed by registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final floor plans and elevations, stamped and signed by a registered architect; and 3) evidence the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

**73 Dale Street** – construct a two story addition (660 sq. ft.) requiring FAR, Design Review and rear yard setback relief (4/3) Pct. 15

Maria Morelli described the case and the zoning relief required. Registered architect Adam Glassman presented the plans. Homeowner and applicant Dingfang Liu described the purpose of the project.

Steven Heikin noted that an entirely new roof with a steeper pitch was designed; the architect confirmed this. Linda Hamlin recommended that the roof line over the mudroom be extended because it ends abruptly and appears “chopped off” as currently designed. Jonathan Simpson questioned the need for skylights in the attic which was not proposed as habitable space and therefore not included in the FAR calculation. Ms. Hamlin responded that the low and narrow dimensions of the attic space would make it impractical for habitable space. Mr. Glassman replied that skylights were proposed to bring in natural light in what he assured the Board was strictly a storage area and that the applicant is very willing to remove the skylights if the Board requests. Furthermore, the use of pull-down stairs to access the attic indicates that the attic is not intended to be used as habitable space. Steven Kanes felt strongly that the presence of skylights indicated that the attic would be used as habitable space. Mr. Liu explained that the presence of natural light from the South would enhance the flow of chi, in accordance with the philosophy of feng shui.

Steve Heikin noted that the entry to the attic is located under an eave and would not be usable because it does not provide adequate headroom in the attic. He recommended moving the attic entry and pull-down stairs.

Robert Cook questioned why a revised draft of the Planning Board report was submitted. Planner Maria Morelli responded that the proposed FAR calculations were not correct and the site plan

and the architectural drawings were inconsistent. She stated that the revised drawings and FAR breakdown and calculations were now accurate.

Rear abutter Joseph Bodoff (64 Forest Street) wanted assurance that the pine tree in the left sideyard would not be removed because it serves as an effective buffer. The applicant replied that measures would be taken to preserve the pine tree. Polly Selkoe recommended that the preservation of the pine tree be offered as a counterbalancing amenity. Although Ms. Hamlin noted that additional plantings, not preservation of existing landscaping, are offered as counterbalancing amenities, she agreed with Ms. Selkoe's comment that preserving the mature specimen would be important. The applicant stated that additional trees would be planted.

Linda Hamlin ***motioned to recommend approval.***  
Robert Cook ***seconded*** the motion.

**Voted (5-1): the Planning Board recommends approval of the plans prepared by Adam Glassman, dated 2/28/ 2014, and site plan by Peter Nolan, dated 11/6/2013, subject to the following conditions:**

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit final plans and elevations subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscape plan indicating all counterbalancing amenities subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final elevations stamped and signed by a registered architect; and 3) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

Steven Kanes ***opposed.***

**79 Coolidge Street** – construct a single-car garage in rear yard requiring side and rear yard setback relief and design of all off-street parking (4/3) Pct. 8

Maria Morelli described the case and the zoning relief required.

Attorney Adam Borowsky from the law office of Robert Allen represented the applicant, Belinda Hunsinger, who was present. Registered architect Dartagnan Brown presented the plans. Mr. and Mrs. Schwartz, prospective owners of 79 Coolidge Street, were also present.

Mr. Brown stated that new plantings in the front of the garage and an installed grass lawn in the rear are offered as counterbalancing amenities.

Steven Heikin noted that the structure could not be built without trespassing on abutters' properties; he asked the applicant's team if they had asked abutter's permission. The applicant's team had not considered this factor.

Marilyn and Lee Rosenbaum, side abutters at 73 Coolidge, stated that they were not opposed to construction of a detached garage, but that locating the garage with no sideyard setback was not acceptable because the garage would be inches away from their kitchen window. The applicant's team is willing to work with the Rosenbaum to modify the design.

The Rosenbaums presented a list of guidelines for a possible redesign of the garage; namely:

[Excerpt from Mr. and Mrs. Rosenbaum's letter, March 19, 2014]

"1. The peak of the garage be kept at 9 feet.

2. The width of the garage be kept to 10 feet and that it be centered in the middle of the drive so that it is 3 feet from our property line (this would allow it to be at least three feet from 79 Coolidge Street).

3. The garage be built so that it is at or behind the back line of the 79 Coolidge Street home."

The case was CONTINUED so that the applicant and the abutters could negotiate the modifications for the redesigned garage.

## **MINUTES OF MARCH 6TH**

The Planning Board voted (6-0) to approve the Minutes of 3/6/14 with revisions.

## **VOTE ON CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) FY 2015-20**

The Planning Board voted (6-0) to approve the CIP letter with revisions.

**Meeting adjourned.**

## **Materials Reviewed During Meeting**

- Staff Reports
- Site Plans and Elevations
- Minutes of the March 6, 2014, Planning Board Meeting
- Capital Improvements Program Letter